



Mr. Steve Macaulay
Chief Deputy Director
California Department of Water Resources
1416 Ninth Street
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236

August 29, 2002

Dear Steve Macaulay,

I have just had the opportunity to look at the Draft August 2002 report "The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report." I greatly appreciate the effort that has gone into this assessment and expect that a final report will be tremendously important for long-term policy decisions.

Nevertheless, the current report has some serious problems. Some of these may be simple problems with the way that the report describes the modeling and results; but some are apparently problems with the modeling work itself.

In particular, the level of delivery reliability projected in the model for 2001-2021 (such as summarized in Tables 1-3), appear to be far higher (around 3 MAF or more) than actual average historical deliveries (closer to 2 MAF). This result strongly suggests that the (i) model is not calibrated properly, (ii) that it fails to include some important factors, or (iii) that some conditions have recently changed that are taken into account in the model, but that are not reflected in the historical data. It is not possible, given the information in the report, to determine which of these possibilities is correct.

I also note that no comparison of model and historical deliveries is presented in the report – a flaw that makes it impossible for the reader to evaluate model calibration. If there is a problem with model calibration, it calls into question the applicability of the CALSIM estimates for a wide range of other policy efforts, including the ongoing Bulletin 160 work. This needs to be addressed, quickly and clearly.

I urge that the report be modified to include (i) explicit assessment and calibration of the model in the context of actual SWP deliveries; (ii) a revised set of model runs if the model calibration proves bad; and (iii) explicit discussion/explanation of why the report suggests that it will be possible for the SWP to produce reliable deliveries substantially higher (perhaps 50% higher) than long-term historical deliveries. If the model proves incorrect, policies based on this report's results could be seriously in error.

I appreciate the opportunity to offer comments and I look forward to seeing a revised Reliability Report.

Sincerely,
Dr. Peter H. Gleick